UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/734,976	12/15/2003	Michael Gauselmann	ADP238	6903	
Horst M. Kaspe	7590 06/05/200 s <b>r</b>	9	EXAMINER		
13 Forest Drive			PIERCE, DAMON JOSEPH		
Warren, NJ 070	139		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3714		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/05/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.		Applicant(s)				
		10/734,976		GAUSELMANN, MICHAEL				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		DAMON PIERCE		3714				
The Period for Re	MAILING DATE of this communication apoly	ppears on the cover s	heet with the co	orrespondence ac	ddress			
WHICHEV - Extensions after SIX (6) - If NO period - Failure to re Any reply re	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLE IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING In time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. For reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutionally ceived by the Office later than three months after the mailing term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS CON 136(a). In no event, howeve will apply and will expire SIX te, cause the application to be	MUNICATION  ir, may a reply be time  ( (6) MONTHS from the decome ABANDONED	ely filed ne mailing date of this o				
Status								
1)⊠ Resi	ponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 L</u>	December 2008						
•	· · ·	s action is non-final.						
<i>,</i>	<b>,</b>			secution as to the	e merits is			
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
	·	Ex parto Quayro, 10	00 0.5. 11, 10	0.0.210.				
Disposition o	f Claims							
4)⊠ Claiı	4) Claim(s) <u>9-16,18-30,35-53 and 77-104</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) (	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)∐ Claiı								
6)⊟ Claiı	n(s) is/are rejected.							
7)∏ Claii	n(s) is/are objected to.							
8)⊠ Claiı	n(s) <u>9-16, 18-30, 35-53, and 77-104</u> are	subject to restriction	n and/or election	n requirement.				
Application P	apers							
_		۵r						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
			-		ED 1 101/d\			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority unde	· 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
2) Notice of D 3) Information	eferences Cited (PTO-892) raftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) //Mail Date	5) No	terview Summary ( aper No(s)/Mail Dat otice of Informal Pa ther:	e				

Application/Control Number: 10/734,976 Page 2

Art Unit: 3714

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Amendment

1. The examiner acknowledges the amendments of claims 40-53, and 77-100. Currently, claims 103-104 has been newly added, and claims 1-8, 17, 31-34, and 54-76 are canceled. Thus, claims 9-16, 18-30, 35-53, and 77-104 are pending.

## Election/Restrictions

Please note: A restriction requirement is being made at this time due to the applicant's amendments and newly added claims, and examiner's understanding of the differences and distinctions of the claim language.

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 9-16, 18-26, 35-37, and 77-83, drawn to a method for operating a coin activated entertainment automat, classified in class 463, subclass 20.
  - II. Claims 27-30, 38-53, and 84-98, drawn to a system of entertainment automats, classified in class 463, subclass 42.
  - III. Claims 99-104, drawn to a method for operating an entertainment automat system, classified in class 463, subclass 16.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

3. Invention I and Inventions II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the

Application/Control Number: 10/734,976

Art Unit: 3714

apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the system of Invention II can be used to practice another and materially different process such as playing a network of entertainment automats.

Page 3

- 4. Inventions I and III are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed have a materially different design such that Invention III has a network of entertainment automats. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.
- 5. Inventions II and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process of Invention III as claimed can be used practiced by another and materially different apparatus that has keys such as "hold key" and "Hand out key".
- 6. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above

and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement

will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 7. After electing one of the above Inventions of I, II, or III, an further election of species is also required within the elected Invention.
- 8. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

If Invention I is elected, applicant is further required to elect one of the following species of Invention I:

- 1A. Claims 9-10, 18-26, 35-37, and 77-83
- 1B. Claims 11-14

If Invention II is elected, applicant is further required to elect one of the following species of Invention II:

2A. Claims 27-30

Application/Control Number: 10/734,976 Page 6

Art Unit: 3714

2B. Claims 38-53, 84-98

If Invention III is elected, applicant is further required to elect one of the following species of Invention III:

3A. Claims 99-100, and 103

3B. Claims 101-102

3C. Claim 104

9. The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a

claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAMON PIERCE whose telephone number is (571)270-1997. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/734,976 Page 8

Art Unit: 3714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dmitry Suhol can be reached on 571-272-4430. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dmitry Suhol/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714

DJP